

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

LARRY LLOYD,

Plaintiff,

V.

BRIAN YANKEY, JOHN DOE (NURSE PRACTITIONER), P.A. JOHNSON, BRUCE KALER, SUE STEVEN,

## Defendants.

CASE NO. C12-5913 RJB/KLS

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
COUNSEL**

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Appointment of Counsel. ECF No. 16. Having fully considered the motion and balance of the record, the Court finds that the motion should be denied.

## DISCUSSION

No constitutional right exists to appointed counsel in a § 1983 action. *Storseth v. Spellman*, 654 F.2d 1349, 1353 (9th Cir. 1981). See also *United States v. \$292,888.04 in U.S. Currency*, 54 F.3d 564, 569 (9th Cir. 1995) (“[a]ppointment of counsel under this section is discretionary, not mandatory.”) However, in “exceptional circumstances,” a district court may appoint counsel for indigent civil litigants pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1) (formerly 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d)). *Rand v. Roland*, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997), overruled on other grounds, 154 F.3d 952 (9th Cir. 1998) (emphasis supplied.) To decide whether exceptional circumstances exist, the court must evaluate both “the likelihood of success on the merits [and] the ability of the petitioner to articulate his claims *pro se* in light of the complexity of the legal

1 issues involved.” *Wilborn v. Escalderon*, 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1986) (quoting  
 2 *Weygandt v. Look*, 718 F.2d 952, 954 (9th Cir. 1983)). A plaintiff must plead facts that show he  
 3 has an insufficient grasp of his case or the legal issue involved and an inadequate ability to  
 4 articulate the factual basis of his claim. *Agyeman v. Corrections Corp. of America*, 390 F.3d  
 5 1101, 1103 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004).

6 That a *pro se* litigant may be better served with the assistance of counsel is not the test.

7 *Rand*, 113 F.3d at 1525. Moreover, the need for discovery does not necessarily qualify the issues  
 8 involved as “complex.” *Wilborn*, 789 F.2d at 1331. Most actions require development of further  
 9 facts during litigation. But, if all that was required to establish the complexity of the relevant  
 10 issues was a demonstration of the need for development of further facts, then practically all cases  
 11 would involve complex legal issues. *Id.*

12 Plaintiff states that he is unable to afford counsel, that his current confinement will limit  
 13 his ability to litigate, that the issues are complex, that he has limited access to a law library and  
 14 limited knowledge of the law. These are not exceptional circumstances. Plaintiff filed his  
 15 complaint *pro se* and has demonstrated an ability to articulate his claims *pro se* in a clear fashion  
 16 understandable to this Court. In addition, Plaintiff was released from the Kitsap County Jail on  
 17 January 7, 2013. ECF No. 18, Exhibit A, Declaration of Ione S. George. Thus, Plaintiff may  
 18 access any law library he chooses and/or seek out an attorney to represent him.

19 Based on Plaintiff’s allegations, the Court notes that this is not a complex case involving  
 20 complex facts or law. In addition, Plaintiff presents no evidence to show that he is likely to  
 21 succeed on the merits of his case. While Plaintiff may not have vast resources or legal training,  
 22 he meets the threshold for a *pro se* litigant. Concerns regarding investigation, access to legal  
 23 resources or examination of witnesses are not exceptional factors, but are the type of difficulties

1 encountered by many pro se litigants. Plaintiff has failed in his burden to demonstrate an  
2 inability to present his claims to this Court without counsel.

3 Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

4 (1) Plaintiff's motion for counsel (ECF No. 16) is **DENIED**.

5 (2) The Clerk shall send a copy of this Order to Plaintiff and counsel for Defendants.

6  
7 **DATED** this 28th day of January, 2013.

8  
9   
10 Karen L. Strombom

11  
12 United States Magistrate Judge

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24